



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DAVID J. THIBODEAU
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P. C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01742-9133

MAILED
DEC 17 2004
Technology Center 2100

In re Application of: Hinshaw et al.
Application No. 10/668,113
Filed: September 18, 2003
For: PROGRAMMABLE STREAMING DATA
PROCESSOR FOR DATABASE APPLIANCE
HAVING MULTIPLE PROCESSING UNIT
GROUPS

**DECISION ON PETITION
TO MAKE SPECIAL
(ACCELERATED
EXAMINATION)
UNDER M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII)**

This is a response to the petition filed March 5, 2004, under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VII [sic]): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.

The Petition is **DISMISSED**.

M.P.E.P. §708.02, Section VIII which sets out the prerequisites for a grantable petition for Accelerated Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) states in relevant part:

A new application (one which has not received any examination by the examiner) may be granted special status provided that applicant (and this term includes applicant's attorney or agent) complies with each of the following items:

- (a) Submits a petition to make special accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h);
- (b) Presents all claims directed to a single invention, or if the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status;
- (c) Submits a statement(s) that a pre-examination search was made, listing the field of search by class and subclass, publication, Chemical Abstracts, foreign patents, etc. **The pre-examination search must be directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested.** A search made by a foreign patent office satisfies this requirement;
- (d) Submits one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record; and

(e) Submits a detailed discussion of the references, which discussion points out, with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

In those instances where the request for this special status does not meet all the prerequisites set forth above, **petitioner will be notified and the defects in the request will be stated**. The application will remain in the status of a new application awaiting action in its regular turn. In those instances where a request is defective in one or more respects, petitioner will be given one opportunity to perfect the request in a renewed petition to make special. If perfected, the request will then be granted. If not perfected in the first renewed petition, any additional renewed petitions to make special may or may not be considered at the discretion of the Group Special Program Examiner.

The petition filed March 5, 2004 fails to adequately meet requirements (c) and (e) of the criteria set forth above.

With respect to requirement (c), the pre-examination search has not been directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested. It is noted that the search terms (listed on page 2 of the petition to make special) include "database", "distributed processing" and other similar terms. Such terms are broad as compared to the language of the claims, which includes such terms as "asymmetric data processor", "programmable streaming data processor", "job processing unit" and the like. Furthermore, other relevant terms (which are recited in the claims) include: nodes, networks, and similar terms. These terms have apparently not been used in the search. Therefore, the *pre-examination search has not been directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested*.

With respect to requirement (e), a complete detailed discussion of the (aforementioned most closely related) references has not been provided with the necessary specificity required under 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c). Petitioner's submission is deficient in that it merely paraphrases the disclosure and/or abstracts (see for example, the discussion of U. S. Patent 6,415,373, which merely paraphrases the title) provided in each reference accompanied by a single statement that all the references do not include the features of the claimed invention. That is, the submission does not satisfy the requirement, as it does not provide a *detailed discussion* of the references and it does not point out how the *claimed subject matter is patentable over the references*.


Petitioner should ensure that the above discussion is directed to how the language of *each of* the independent claims is specifically distinguishable and patentable from the references provided in requirement (d) above.

Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.

Petitioner is given one opportunity to perfect the petition. Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the mail date of this decision.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.

• *Application SN 10/668,113*
Decision on Petition



Brian L. Johnson
Special Program Examiner
Technology Center 2100
Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security
571-272-3595

HMJ: 12/06/04